

Message

---

**From:** Maier, Brent [Maier.Brent@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** 3/25/2019 3:16:42 PM  
**To:** Sanchez, Yolanda [Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Calvino, Maria Soledad [Calvino.Maria@epa.gov]; LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]  
**Subject:** RE: Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

Yolanda –

Thanks for the update and will pass on joining you and Soledad for the 9:30am call. I spoke with Lily on Friday and based on that call and reading the e-mail traffic below, I feel I understand where things are at.

*Brent Maier*

Congressional Liaison  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX  
75 Hawthorne St. (OPA-3)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Ph: 415.947.4256  
Mobile: 415.760.9170

---

**From:** Sanchez, Yolanda  
**Sent:** Sunday, March 24, 2019 1:15 PM  
**To:** Maier, Brent <Maier.Brent@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** Calvino, Maria Soledad <Calvino.Maria@epa.gov>; LEE, LILY <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>  
**Subject:** Fwd: Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

Brent,  
FYI - Stoker reaching out to Pelosi's office. Hopefully, someone else has shared already.  
Soledad and I have a standing Monday morning 9:30 am call on HPNS. Please let me know if you want to join.

Yolanda

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Manzanilla, Enrique" <Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov>  
**Date:** March 22, 2019 at 2:10:15 PM PDT  
**To:** "LEE, LILY" <LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV>, "Herrera, Angeles" <Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov>, "Maldonado, Lewis" <Maldonado.Lewis@epa.gov>, "Chesnutt, John" <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>, "Butler, Thomas" <Butler.Thomas@epa.gov>, "Fairbanks, Brianna" <Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov>, "Yogi, David" <Yogi.David@epa.gov>, "Sanchez, Yolanda" <Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov>  
**Cc:** "Lyons, John" <Lyons.John@epa.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

Internal/Deliberative

---

**From:** Manzanilla, Enrique  
**Sent:** Friday, March 22, 2019 2:08 PM  
**To:** Stoker, Michael B. <stoker.michael@epa.gov>

**Subject:** RE: Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

**Importance:** High

Great Mike.

Thank you for staving off a difficult situation.

I just got off the phone with my Navy counterpart, Laura Duchnak, before seeing your email.

We tentatively agreed (if both you and Karnig agree) to have all parties (EPA, Navy, State of CA), at Laura and my level, meet on April 15 to discuss the Navy's March 15 letter and its implications for both the Parcel G workplan and the 5 year review. My plan would be to send a letter to that effect on Monday to Laura proposing the meeting. The FFA has a provision that provides any Party the ability to call a meeting to discuss matters of concern. We would invoke that simple provision in response to their March 15 letter.

In preparation for the April 15 meeting, I would send Laura a second letter describing our path forward for both the Parcel G workplan and the 5 year review.

I envision the April 15 meeting as one last attempt to reach agreement before invoking the dispute provisions in the FFA.

I think this is a good path forward which hopefully you and Karnig can bless when you speak on Tuesday.

Call me if you have any questions.

Enrique

---

**From:** Stoker, Michael B.

**Sent:** Friday, March 22, 2019 1:48 PM

**To:** Manzanilla, Enrique <[Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov](mailto:Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Fwd: Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

FYI...

Michael Stoker

EPA Regional Administrator-Region 9

Cell [\(213\) 215-3104](tel:2132153104)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Edmonson, Robert" <[Robert.Edmonson@mail.house.gov](mailto:Robert.Edmonson@mail.house.gov)>

**Date:** March 22, 2019 at 12:31:35 PM PDT

**To:** "Stoker, Michael B." <[stoker.michael@epa.gov](mailto:stoker.michael@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

Copy; thanks!

**Robert Edmonson**

Chief of Staff | Congresswoman Nancy Pelosi

1236 Longworth HOB | 202-225-0100

---

**From:** Stoker, Michael B. <[stoker.michael@epa.gov](mailto:stoker.michael@epa.gov)>

**Sent:** Friday, March 22, 2019 3:14 PM

**To:** Edmonson, Robert <Robert.Edmonson@mail.house.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

Robert,  
Good news. Karnig called and said Navy will not submit anything to us until we talk and further said he believes the Navy will agree with EPA response going forward. I will talk to Karnig next Tuesday. I'll let you know how it goes. Have a nice weekend.

Best regards,  
Michael Stoker  
EPA Regional Administrator-Region 9  
Cell (213) 215-3104

On Mar 22, 2019, at 9:49 AM, Stoker, Michael B. <[stoker.michael@epa.gov](mailto:stoker.michael@epa.gov)> wrote:

Robert,  
As you know I've kept you and Speaker Pelosi aware of all developments regarding Hunters Point. I wanted to share with you an email I just sent Karnig. It looks like the EPA and the Navy will be publicly disagreeing on the appropriate course of action to be taken going forward. Please feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Best regards,  
Michael Stoker  
EPA Regional Administrator-Region 9  
Cell (213) 215-3104

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** [stoker.michael@epa.gov](mailto:stoker.michael@epa.gov)  
**Date:** March 22, 2019 at 8:46:33 AM PDT  
**To:** [karnig.ohannessian@navy.mil](mailto:karnig.ohannessian@navy.mil)  
**Subject:** Potential Disagreement between the EPA and Navy

Good afternoon Karnig:

Enrique passed along the email below from his staff relaying the navy's intention to release in final the parcel G Workplan and the Hunters Point 5 year review. Last Friday, your San Diego office also sent Enrique and our state partners a letter announcing your decision to adopt a DOE radionuclide risk assessment methodology rather than the PRG methodology that has been at the center of our dialogue to date on Hunters Point.

My staff will promptly review these latest products from the Navy in accordance with provisions of the Federal Facility Agreement and its dispute provisions.

Based on some preliminary feedback, I am concerned that the Navy's latest submittals are inconsistent with EPA CERCLA policy and a step backwards from a coherent and transparent approach to this controversial and challenging dilemma at the Hunters Point superfund site.

Per my discussions with you last month during our short meeting, I wanted to fulfill my standing commitment to alert you to potential areas of public disagreement.

Feel free to contact me at your convenience if you wish to discuss this further.

Best Regard  
Mike Stoker  
Regional Administrator, Region 9, US-EPA  
(213) 215-3104

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "LEE, LILY" <[LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV](mailto:LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV)>  
**Date:** March 21, 2019 at 6:06:28 PM  
PDT  
**To:** "Manzanilla, Enrique"  
<[Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov](mailto:Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov)>  
**Cc:** "Herrera, Angeles"  
<[Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov](mailto:Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov)>,  
"Chesnutt, John"  
<[Chesnutt.John@epa.gov](mailto:Chesnutt.John@epa.gov)>,  
"Maldonado, Lewis"  
<[Maldonado.Lewis@epa.gov](mailto:Maldonado.Lewis@epa.gov)>,  
"Fairbanks, Brianna"  
<[Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov](mailto:Fairbanks.Brianna@epa.gov)>,  
"Sanchez, Yolanda"  
<[Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov](mailto:Sanchez.Yolanda@epa.gov)>, "Yogi,  
David" <[Yogi.David@epa.gov](mailto:Yogi.David@epa.gov)>, "Butler,  
Thomas" <[Butler.Thomas@epa.gov](mailto:Butler.Thomas@epa.gov)>  
**Subject:** Navy plans to issue final  
versions Friday morning of Hunters  
Point 5YR and Parcel G WP

Dear Enrique,

Stephen Banister, Navy RPM lead on the Five Year Review just called to give me a courtesy heads up that this afternoon his management met and decided that tomorrow morning, the Navy will issue final versions of the Hunters Point Five Year Review and the Parcel G Removal Site Evaluation Work Plan. The Navy will send EPA a link to electronic versions of both documents. Hard copies will come by mail next week.

The Five Year Review will not include any updated evaluations of current Remedial Goals (RGs) in the Records of Decision (RODs). It will defer evaluation of protectiveness of ROD RGs until after new testing results from Parcel G. The Parcel G Work Plan will use the current ROD RGs for decisions about 1) what levels would trigger the need to clean up material and 2) how sensitive the testing methods need to be.

EPA has not submitted our final written comments on the previous draft versions of these documents because we have been working to resolve issues through informal verbal discussions.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Lily